



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/808,357	03/15/2001	Hiroki Ichiki	1080.1093/JDH	3419

21171 7590 04/14/2003

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
700 11TH STREET, NW  
SUITE 500  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

FILIPCZYK, MARCIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

3

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/808,357

Applicant(s)

ICHIKI ET AL.

Examiner

Marc R Filipczyk

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 March 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2171

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This Action is responsive to application filed on March 15, 2001 in which claims 1-5 are presented for examination.

#### ***Drawings***

Figures 1, 2 and 3 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

#### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Page 1, lines 19-23, sentence structure needs revisions. Page 2, line 24, "even" should be event. Because of these and other mistakes found in the specification, Examiner requests that the grammar and sentence structure of the entire disclosure be reviewed.

Appropriate corrections are required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, lines 4-9, the functions of information sources are indefinite. Further, "outputting an individual index representatives of an information group capable of being provided by oneself" is indefinite. What does that mean and how is it accomplished? Still, further the term "information group" is indefinite. Line 11, the term "finally" is indefinite.

Regarding claim 2, lines 4-11, the functions of information sources are indefinite. Further, "outputting an individual index representatives of an information group capable of being provided by oneself" is indefinite. What does that mean and how is it accomplished? Line 20, the term "finally" is indefinite. Last, the mediating apparatus is a system. What are all of its components and how are they incorporated?

Regarding claims 3-5 depend from claim 1 and therefore contain informalities and inconsistencies of that claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected as best as the Examiner is able to ascertain under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Skinner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,198).

Regarding claim 1, AAPA discloses an information providing system comprising: (fig. 3, AAPA)

Art Unit: 2171

a plurality of information sources, each having an information providing function, and outputting an individual index; (fig. 3, items 2, 6 and 8, AAPA)

a retrieval engine having an index construction function, and an information retrieval function (fig. 3, items 3 and 4, AAPA), but does not teach a mediating apparatus.

However, Skinner discloses an integrated three-tier application framework with automated class and table generation (title and abstract, Skinner) wherein a mediator (fig. 2, items 210 and 216, *server*, Skinner) along with a retrieval engine (fig. 3, items 202 and 206, *browser*) and plurality of information sources (fig. 3, items 212 and 218, *database server*, Skinner) is used to generate data classes.

Hence, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified AAPA indexing system in view of Skinner by applying the mediator (application server) to serve as a middle ware in the AAPA system and interact between retrieval engines and information servers. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use a mediator in the AAPA system because Skinner's mediator is implemented to work with indexes as disclosed by Skinner.

(Note: metadata used in Skinner is an index).

Claims 2-5 are rejected as best as the Examiner is able to ascertain under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skinner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,198) in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Regarding claims 2-5, Skinner discloses a receiving section for receiving a plurality of indexes outputted by a plurality of information sources (fig. 2, items 210, 212 and 214, Skinner);

Art Unit: 2171

(Note: database server retrieves metadata which are indexes)

an index selection section for selecting an individual index satisfying a predetermined index selection condition from indexes received by the receiving section (fig. 5B, block 505, *MetaParameter*, and fig. 7A, block 700, Skinner); and

an index sending section for sending the selected index to a retrieval engine (fig. 2, items 210, 204 and 206, Skinner) for use in an index construction function, where the retrieval engine receiving at least one index constructs a general index (fig. 9, items 300A (client), 903 (generated code, metadata on client site), Skinner).

Skinner discloses a “generic” version of the mediator taught by the Applicant, however, specific details of all the sections of Applicant’s mediator in light of the specification and the handling of a push program are not taught by Skinner. Still, having the Skinner reference in view of the AAPA system the Applicant is improving, Examiner asserts it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Skinner system with the AAPA system and derive with a mediator that performs all the functions disclosed by the Applicant including the handling of a push program (fig. 3, item 6, AAPA) from multiple data sources. This would have been accomplished because Skinner’s middle ware positioned in the AAPA system would automatically receive push programs from servers (fig. 3, AAPA). One would have been motivated to use Skinner system in view of AAPA because the middle ware disclosed and taught by Skinner handles the selecting, retrieving and sending of indexes (data) accordingly, and that is what the AAPA system lacks and needs, and the implementation of the Skinner system in view of AAPA could have been accomplished with minimal configuration changes to the middle ware.

*Conclusion*

To expedite the process of examination Examiner requests that all future correspondences in regard to overcoming prior art rejections or other issues (e.g. 35 U.S.C. 112) set forth by the Examiner that Applicants provide and link to the most specific page and line numbers of the disclosure where the best support is found.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art with respect to mediating index apparatuses.

U.S. Patent No. 5,765,149 of Burrows

U.S. Patent No. 6,108,646 of Mohri et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc R Filipczyk whose telephone number is 703-305-7156. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/808,357

Page 7

Art Unit: 2171

MF

April 10, 2003



SAFET METJAHIC  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100